



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,021	12/13/2001	Yukiyasu Fukami	NAK1-BQ58	2418
21611	7590	12/21/2006	EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER LLP 600 ANTON BOULEVARD SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			PYZOWCHA, MICHAEL J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2137		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		12/21/2006		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/023,021	FUKAMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Pyzocha	2137

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 10/30/2006, 12/13/2001

13.  Other: See Continuation Sheet.

  
 EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 12/05/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Examiner Schubert suggested an amendment to overcome the Akiyama reference and this reference was improperly used again in the final office action. With respect to this argument, the reference was used again but in further view of Colligan, and therefore Colligan changes the rejection. For example, Akiyama teaches the use of different keys for different modes of transmission (i.e. each different channel as described in column 27). Therefore, when modified with the teachings of Colligan the different keys are selected for the different modes which are taught by Colligan. Therefore, the use of Akiyama was still proper based on the addition of the Colligan reference.

Applicant argues that Colligan fails to teach the, "normal reproduction mode includes a play mode and that the particular mode includes a fast forward mode. However Colligan teaches a first mode, which encrypts all frames of a video (see column 11 lines 9-14) this corresponds to a play mode because when playing a video each frame must be processed. Next Colligan teaches a mode in which only the I-frames are encrypted (see column 11 lines 24-47). This corresponds to a fast forward mode because when fast-forwarding only certain frames will be visible (i.e. the I-frames).

Applicant also argues that there is no motivation to combine the references as put forth and they are not related to the problem being solved. However the specific motivations for making the modifications are put forth on pages 4 and 5 of the final office action, as to allow conditional access while maintaining the safety level (see Akiyama Abstract) and to provide different levels of security (see Colligan column 11 lines 9-57). With respect to Applicant's argument that they are not related to the problem being solved, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, all of the references are in the field of applicant's endeavor as securing broadcasted information.

Continuation of 13. Other: It appears the IDS filed 12/13/2001 had never been considered and it has now been considered.